



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 09/535,161 Confirmation No. : 4480
First Named Inventor : Mohamed F. LOUBARIS
Filed : March 24, 2000
TC/A.U. : 2644
Examiner : W F Briney III

Docket No. : 100718.54209US
Customer No. : 23911

Title : Electronic Switching System

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following comments are addressed to the Reasons for Allowance of independent claim 22 as stated at item 1 on page 2 of the Notice of Allowability dated May 9, 2005.

REMARKS

According to the statement of the Examiner, claim 22 is limited to "an electronic switching system for connecting electronically a common source of voltage to a chosen user station selected from a plurality of user stations connected in parallel" and that the reference to Ryan discloses an exclusionary device for coupling plural telephone devices to a single central office trunk and "in particular one device is connected at a time". Reference is made to the Abstract and Figure 3 for depiction of an embodiment of Ryan with two devices 82 and 84 sharing a connection with a central office trunk 18'. The intervening circuitry 26, 28 between the central trunk 18' and each of the two devices 82 and 84 corresponds, according to the Examiner, to a cell associated with each user station. The reference to Ryan in view of Close, according to the statement of the

Examiner, fails to disclose the bridge of four diodes and Ryan in view of Close does not teach any means for rectification of the incoming voltage from the central office trunk 18 prime. Therefore, in conclusion, the Examiner indicates that "Ryan in view of Close makes obvious all limitations of the claim with the exception of a first electronic device for rectification of alternating and direct current through the cell and for electronic separation of a ground of each cell from respective grounds of other ones of said cell."

Applicants' respectfully submit that the reference to Ryan '465 does not have a means for connecting a chosen one of the two user stations to the common line. Ryan has a relay contact for disconnecting the other station of the common line. When the two stations are inactive, the line voltage falls on the two telephone hooks. Because the four relay contacts 58, 60 of the user stations 82 and 62, 64 of the user station 84 are normally closed, this accounts for the line voltage to fall on the two hooks. It is for this reason that the stations 82 and 84 are still connected over the hook to the common line. That is, when the station 82 occupies the line, corresponding contacts 58, 60 remain closed. The line current flows in the branch 26' when the telephone hook switch of station 82 is closed. The telephone hooks which is the only one connecting means which belongs to the telephone and which is external to the Ryan devices. When the station 84 occupies the line, a similar reasoning applies. Thus, there is no disclosure of the connecting means, in particular the "device to connect the corresponding user station to the common source of voltage". Thus, Applicants' submit that Ryan does not disclose a device for connection which corresponds to the claimed invention.

Additionally, the indication that the circuitry 26' and 28' between the central office trunk 18 and each of the devices 82 and 84 corresponds to a cell, it is traverse. Ryan does not have a device which is connected in the claimed manner and which corresponds to a cell, as claimed. Nor does Ryan have a teaching for a rectification of the incoming voltage from the central office trunk

as is required by claim 22. The branches 26 and 28 of Ryan, when viewed from the trunk 18', are in parallel and have neither a ground nor a separation of ground. In this configuration, there is no possibility for rectification means because the ring function of the device would be disabled. Additionally, Ryan uses an external power supply so no rectification is needed. Therefore, for the above reasons, Applicants' submit that claim 22 and the dependent claims 23-36, which depend from claim 22 are allowed not only for the reasons indicated by the Examiner, but because of the failure of Ryan or the secondary reference to teach the above discussed limitations which additionally exist in claim 22 and with which Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analysis concerning the showing of Ryan when compared to claim 22.

Respectfully submitted,

August 9, 2005



Vincent J. Sunderdick
Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
VJS:ddd

#390181